arXiv:1703.10236v1 [quant-ph] 27 Mar 2017

Any Quantum Network is Structurally Controllable by a Single Driving Signal

Michael Siomau
Physics Department, Jazan University, P.O. Box 114, 45142 Jazan, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
(Dated: March 31, 2017)

Control theory concerns with the question if and how it is possible to drive the behavior of a complex dynamical system. A system is said to be controllable if we can drive it from any initial state to any desired final state in finite time. For many complex networks, the precise knowledge of system parameters lacks. But, it is possible to make a conclusion about network controllability by inspecting its structure. Classical theory of structural controllability [1] is based on the Lin's structural controllability theorem [2], which gives necessary and sufficient conditions to conclude if any network is structurally controllable. Due to this fundamental theorem we may identify a minimum driver vertex set, whose control with independent driving signals is sufficient to make the whole system controllable. I show that the Lin's theorem does not impose any limitations on quantum networks structural controllability. By local operations and classical communication [3], one can modify any quantum network to make it structurally controllable by a single driving signal.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Ac, 89.75.Fb

Here I shall focus on Linear Time-Invariant (LTI) systems only. Representing the system by a graph, the LTI property means that the vertices may interact linearly with each other if connected by an edge; while the graph structure is static, i.e. edges cannot appear or disappear. The strength of the interaction represented by an edge may take arbitrary non-zero value in time.

Consider a LTI system $(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ represented by a directed graph (digraph) $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B}) = (\mathbf{V_G};\mathbf{E})$. The vertex set $V_G = V \bigcup U$ includes both the state vertices V corresponding to the N vertices of the network, and the driving vertices U, corresponding to the M input signals that are called the roots of the digraph $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$. The edge set $E = E_V \bigcup E_U$ consists of the edges among state vertices E_V, corresponding to the connections of network, and the edges connecting driving vertices to state vertices E_U. In this terms, Lin's theorem is given as: The system $(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ is *not* structurally controllable if and only if it has *inaccessible nodes* or *dilations*.



FIG. 1: (a) A digraph with a single root. Network vertices and edges are shown in grey; driving vertices and edges - in blue. Vertex $\{V_4\}$ is inaccessible from the driving vertex $\{U_1\}$. Vertices $\{V_1, V_3, V_2\}$ form a dilation. (b) Elementary path $\{V_6, V_3, V_1\}$ and two elementary cycles $\{V_2, V_4\}$ and $\{V_5, V_7\}$ connected to the root $\{U_1\}$ form a cactus. This network is structurally controllable by a single drive.

A state vertex is inaccessible if there are no directed paths reaching it from the input vertices. An inaccessible vertex can not be influenced by driving signals, making the whole network uncontrollable. The digraph $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ contains a dilation if there is a subset of vertices $S \subset V$ such that the neighborhood set of S has fewer vertices than S itself. Roughly speaking, dilations are subgraphs in which a small subset of vertices attempts to rule a larger subset of vertices (see Fig. 1a).

The formulation of the theorem above is not practical, because doesn't tell us how many driving signals we should have in a given network to make controllable. Let me give another formulation in new terms. A graph is *spanned* by a subgraph if the subgraph and the graph have the same vertex set. For a digraph, a sequence of oriented edges $\{v_1 \to v_2, ..., v_{k-1} \to v_k\}$, where vertices $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_{k-1}, v_k\}$ are distinct, is called an *elementary path* C. When v_k coincides with v_1, the sequence of edges is called an *elementary cycle* O. For the digraph $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$, let me define the following subgraphs: (i) a stem is an elementary path originating from an input vertex; (ii) a bud is an elementary cycle C with an additional edge e that ends, but does not begin, in a vertex of the cycle; (iii) a cactus is defined recursively: a stem C is a cactus. Let C, O, and e be, respectively, a cactus, an elementary cycle that is disjoint with C, and an arc that connects C to O in $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$. Then, $C \cup \{e\} \cup O$ is also a cactus. $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ *is spanned by cacti if there exists a set of disjoint cacti that covers all state vertices.* A cactus is a minimal structure that contains neither inaccessible nodes nor dilations, hence the Lin's theorem may be formulated as: An LTI system $(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ is structurally controllable if and only if $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$ is spanned by cacti (see Fig. 1b).

A complex network is unlikely to be spanned by a single cactus. But, it may be spanned by a few. Since the control of a single cactus requires a single root (i.e.



FIG. 2: (a) A graph to find a minimum driver set. (b) Maximum matching is shown in red. Only two vertices $\{V_6\}$ and $\{V_7\}$ are unmatched. Hence, the network requires two independent drives/roots to be controllable.



FIG. 3: (a) By LOCC we may loop the elementary path $\{V_6, V_5, V_4, V_2\}$ into an elementary circle increasing maximal matching of the quantum digraph. (b) The modification of the quantum digraph with LOCC may be viewed as creation of a supervertex $\{V_{2-6}\}$.

driving signal), to control a complex network we need as many driving signals as many cacti span the network. In practice, we want to find the minimal number of the driving signals to apply – the so-called minimum input problem. Hence, we need to find the minimal number of cacti to span a given network. At first glance, this combinatorial problem is a NP-hard, but in fact can be resolved in polynomial time with *the maximum matching algorithm*.

In a digraph, a matching is defined to be a *set of directed edges* that do not share common start or end vertices. A vertex is matched if it is the end vertex of a matching edge. Otherwise, it is unmatched. Maximum matching is a matching of the largest size. This definitions allow us to formulate the Minimum input theorem: To fully control a system $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$, the minimum number of driver vertices is $N_D = \max\{N - M, 1\}$, where M is the size of the maximum matching in $G(\mathbf{A};\mathbf{B})$. In other words, *the driver vertices correspond to the unmatched vertices* (see Fig. 2). If all vertices are matched $M = N$ (as in case of an elementary cycle), we need at least one input to control the network, hence $N_D = 1$. We can choose any vertex as our driver vertex in this case. Note, that in general the maximum matching is not unique, i.e. the network may be controllable with different minimal sets of driver vertices. But, all these minimal sets are of the same size.

I show that with local operations and classical communication (LOCC) it is always possible to increase maximal matching to achieve $N_D = 1$. A quantum network is a graph, where vertices have identical quantum systems represented by their quantum states. The edges represent quantum channels, through which the vertices may interact, for example, by sending photons. The quantum channels are directed. The presence of edges also imply the ability of classical communication between vertices. I assume no restrictions on the direction of classical communication, i.e. the vertices may exchange classical information with no restrictions, if connected by an edge.

Suppose, we have a connected quantum network represented by a digraph and of the same configuration as in Fig. 2a. We may execute the classical maximum matching algorithm to identify the minimal set of driving vertices. Then, we may just loop all elementary paths into elementary cycles, leaving just one (see Fig. 3a). This is done by creating non-local entanglement edges between physically disconnected vertices by LOCC [4]. For any quantum graph the number of LOCC is at most N^3 [5]. Consequently, we have only one elementary path and a number of elementary cycles – a cactus – which is structurally controllable by a single driving signal. In other words, any quantum network is spanned by a cactus after polynomial number of LOCC.

When connecting two distant vertices with an entanglement edge, we allow joint quantum evolution of the states of the vertices, i.e. $|\psi_{2-6}\rangle \neq |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\psi_6\rangle$. Effectively, we unite two distant vertices into a single supervertex (see Fig. 3b). This interpretation may be useful if analyzing LTI quantum system controllability in matrix representation [1].

In summary, my result shows a radical difference between classical and quantum network controllability and urge a complete revision of our knowledge of complex quantum system dynamics.

[1] Y.-Y. Liu and A.-L. Barabasi, arXiv:1508.05384v2 (2016).
[2] C.-T. Lin, IEEE Trans. Auto. Contr. **19**, 201 (1974).
[3] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000).
[4] M. Siomau, Phys. Lett. A **381**, 136 (2017).
[5] M. Siomau, AIP Conf. Proc. **1742**, 030017 (2016).